

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 16-17 and 20-21 are amended. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with appropriate, defined status identifiers.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as indefinite for having insufficient antecedent basis for “the local network.” The claims have been amended to correct this error. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action, Claims 16-17 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-17

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 2005/0195780 (Haverinen *et al.*) in view of U.S. 2004/0267874 (Westberg *et al.*) Claims 1, 2, 8, and 16-17 have been amended, rendering the rejection moot. However, as amended, the claims are patentable over the combination of Haverinen *et al.* and Westberg *et al.*

Haverinen *et al.* describes an IP mobility system which enables “mobility for secure network connections.” (Para. [0010].) In particular, Haverinen *et al.* describes a system where the same IP address is used as both an “internal IP address” and a “home address” by a “VPN node and the home agent.” (Para. [0011].) In the Office action on page 4, the Examiner asserts that Figure 2 and paragraphs 21-23 of Haverinen *et al.* show “signaling end-to-end service related parameters via a separate signaling element.” However, Fig. 2 is a “block diagram illustrating a network topology” without any indication or suggestion of a “signaling element” or “end-to-end service related parameters.” Paragraphs 21-23 of Haverinen *et al.* describe a secure network (SN) connecting to a variety of other networks (para. [0021]), a mobile node (MN) accessing the SN by a “secure tunnel” provided by a VPN gateway (para. [0022]), and a correspondent host (CH) communicating data with the MN via the SN (para. [0023]). There is no mention or suggestion in Paragraphs 21-23 of Haverinen *et al.* of a “signaling element” or “end-to-end service related parameters.”

Independent claim 1, as amended, includes:

signalling end-to-end service related parameters for communication between the mobile terminal and the wireless local network,

communicating a resource authorization identifier to the mobile terminal,

transmitting the resource authorization identifier to the mobile network via the wireless local network,

receiving a request for authorization from the mobile network on the basis of the resource authorization identifier, and

sending an authorization response to bind a tunnel between the mobile terminal and the mobile network to an end-to-end data flow of the mobile terminal wherein the authorization response comprises identification information on the end-to-end data flow and tunnel identification information identifying the tunnel.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests “transmitting the resource authorization identifier to the mobile network via the wireless local network” is shown in paragraph [0027] of Haverinen *et al.* where it says “MN determines whether or not an association with a 2nd node can be established.” Applicant does not understand how determining whether an association can be made at a mobile mode suggests transmitting a resource authorization identifier to the mobile network. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner clarify his position on this point.

On pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner seems to suggest that Haverinen *et al.* shows a “separate signaling element” and an “authorization response.” However, it is not clear to Applicant what exactly in Haverinen *et al.* corresponds to the separate signaling element and the authorization response. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner clarify his position on this point.

Among other claim elements not taught or suggested, Haverinen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest “sending an authorization response to bind a tunnel between the mobile terminal and the mobile network to an end-to-end data flow of the mobile terminal.” Haverinen *et al.* does not have such an authorization request. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states, “Haverinen does not specifically disclose binding a tunnel between the communication nodes as defined by applicant.” The Examiner argues that Westberg *et al.* teaches this. Westberg *et al.* does teach “an IPSec ‘tunnel’ over the public network between the remote-end host and the home-end host.” (Para. [0004].) However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Westberg *et al.* that a tunnel is bound after a signaling element provides an authorization response having end-to-end data flow and tunnel identification information identifying the tunnel. With respect to claims 8, 9, 16, 17, and 22, Westberg *et al.* does not teach or suggest that the mobile network requests authorization from a signaling element for binding a tunnel. With respect to claim 15, Westberg *et al.* does not teach or suggest use of “a separate signalling element” (separate from the wireless terminal and mobile network) during the negotiation of end-to-end service related parameters, and ... transmit the resource authorization identifier to the mobile network by using the tunnel.”

Indeed, the combination of Haverinen *et al.* and Westberg *et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least one element from each of the rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-17. For example, the combination of Haverinen *et al.* and Westberg *et al.* fails to teach or suggest:

sending an authorization response to bind a tunnel between the mobile terminal and the mobile network to an end-to-end data flow of the mobile terminal wherein the authorization response comprises identification information on the end-to-end data flow and tunnel identification information identifying the tunnel.

from Claim 1,

the mobile network is configured to bind a tunnel between the mobile terminal and the mobile network to an end-to-end data flow of the mobile terminal on the basis of an authorization response received from the signalling element and comprising identification information on the end-to-end data flow and tunnel identification information identifying the tunnel.

from Claim 8, and

the network element is configured to bind a tunnel between the mobile terminal and the mobile network to an end-to-end data flow of the mobile terminal on the basis of an authorization response received from the signalling element and comprising identification information on the end-to-end data flow and tunnel identification information identifying the tunnel.

from Claim 9. The present application addresses use of the signaling element.

[0008] The advantage of the invention is that a policy authorized by a signalling element, such as a SIP end-to-end quality-of-service negotiation signalling element, may be used in a system in which the mobile terminal accesses the mobile network via a wireless local network. Thus, it is possible to arrange a service in the local system comprising the mobile network and the wireless local network on the basis of a confirmation from the signalling element. By the authorization, it is possible to achieve mapping between the data flow in the system of the mobile network and the wireless local network and the end-to-end data flow.

(emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 5 and 13

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Haverinen *et al.* in view of Westberg *et al.* and further in view of U.S. 2005/0163078 (Oba *et al.*). Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 and Claim 13 depends from Claim 9. Claim 1 has been amended herein, rendering the rejection moot. However, as amended, the claims are patentable over the combination of Haverinen *et al.*, Westberg *et al.*, and Oba *et al.*

Oba *et al.* does not provide the teachings missing from the combination of Haverinen *et al.* and Westberg *et al.*, discussed above. As such, the combination of Haverinen *et al.*, Westberg *et al.*, and Oba *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element of Claims 5 and 13. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extension of time is needed for timely acceptance of

papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extension fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 11, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23524
Telephone: (608) 258-4292
Facsimile: (608) 258-4258

By 

Paul S. Hunter
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,787